डा० रामाकर पाण्डेय (उत्तर प्रदेश) : माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, यह जीवन-मरण का प्रश्न है, उसकी ओर मैं ध्यान दिलाना चाहता हूं । संघ लोक सेवा आयोग के दरवाजे पर पांच छात्र हिन्दी और भारतीय भाषाओं को परीक्षा का माध्यम बनाने के लिए ....(**व्यवधान**)...उनमें से एक की हालत...(**व्यवधान**)...वह डैथ बैड पर है...(**व्यवधान**)...27 तारीख से वह चल रहा है...(**व्यवधान**)...उसपर सरकार को ध्यान देना चाहिए... (व्यवधान)...जीवन-मरण का प्रश्न था, इसलिए मैंने उठा दिया...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, please sit down. No, no, I don't allow it. Nothing will go on record.

श्री वीरेन्द्र वर्मा (उत्तर प्रदेश) : उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, सुन लें : बहुत गंभीर प्रश्न है...(**व्यवधान**)...

श्री लाल कृष्ण आडवाणी (मध्य प्रदेश): सोशल मैंशन में एलाउ कर दीजिएगा ...(**व्यवधान**)...

MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME FOR THE PRESENTATION OF THE REPORT OF THE JOINT COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSES ON THE SHIPPING AGENTS (LICENSING) BILL, 1988

SHRI BHASKAR ANNAJI MASODKAR (Maharashtra): Sir, I beg to move the following Motion:—

"That the time appointed for the presentation of the Report of Joint Committee of the Houses on the Shipping Agents (Licensing) Bill, 1987, be extended up to the first day of the last week of the 151st Session of the Rajya Sabha."

The question was put, and the motion was adopted.

DISCUSSION ON THE WORKING OF THE MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS—Contd.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Shri Narasimha Rao.

श्री रजनी रंजन साहू : उपसभाध्यक्ष जी, आज के अखबार में छपे हुए पर, जो 'टाइम्स आफ इण्डिया' में छपा है ...(**व्यवधान**)...

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): I have called the Minister.

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): Sir, this debate, I am afraid, has been rather intermittent and of a diffused nature spread over many days and also interrupted by three days on which we had no Parliament sittings. However, Members have made some important points. Although each one of these issues needs a separate debate, deserves a separate debate in the Houses of Parliament, pending the possibility of getting enough time for such debates, I shall only respond to certain selected issues which I consider important and which have been raised in the debate.

Sir, I start with the world situation in general because that is how most of the Members also started their speeches, and that is how one has to start any debate on international relations. The situation as we found it after the INF treaty, has been described in many debates in this House, in many of our speeches, in many fora of the world. We made a categorical statement, positive statement on the floor of the United Nations. We expressed great hope that the situation as it developed after the INF treaty, would continue unabated in the same direction and become irreversible as soon as possible. We could see the light at the end of the tunnel and we could also see, or at least imagine, that the tunnel is not too long.

There was a change from confrontation to dialogue. These are sentences which have been found in

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

several speeches, several statements and several declarations. Relaxation of tension everywhere has taken place. And lastly, resolution of regional conflicts somehow became much less difficult than what it was. In fact, in many areas we could see a very rapid progress in the first few months. Today, again, the atmosphere has changed. The rhetoric has changed. But unfortunately, after about two years of the INF Treaty, if we look at the scene more carefully and critically, we find that still a meeting of minds is a long way off. This is regretable because this has been the world's experience that whenever detente started, it started very fast and very hopefully. And when it came up against hurdles, there was something like a U-turn and the world found itself in a worse situation than before the detente started. We hoped that that would not happen now. We still hope that that will not happen now.

But I must say that the international scene today is very different from what we thought it would be on the occasion of the INF Treaty and immediately after the INF Treaty was concluded. I will give a few examples. We thought that after the Iran-Iraq war ended, the peace process between the two countries would soon come to a stage where one could say that this long ten-year war has been obliterated, although it is not easy to obliterate the after-effects of that war. We also thought that it would be possible for both countries to embark immediately on a process of reconstruction which was long overdue. Somehow after initial success, progress has considerably slowed down and issues in the conflict seem to have been stalemated. It has not been reversed, fortunately. We have been in touch with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. He was here some months back. But we find that the momentum has been lost. It has not come to zero, but we think that there is a lot of effort needed to get back the momentum and see that the conflict is resolved amicably and finally.

Coming to Afghanistan, my colleague, the Minister of State, Mr. Natwar Singh, has already dwelt on this subject and has given the House the latest position as we find it. In fact, there is nothing like the latest position. It is evolving from day to day. Unfortunately, now there is again an attempt to settle the Afghan question by force of arms. What was happening for ten years and what we thought had been reversed has not been reversed. The trend continues. The fortunes in the battlefield seem to be still looming large in the entire issue of Afghanistan and that is what we very much regret. India has stood for the whole package. The package contains the withdrawal of the Soviet troops. The package also contains the Geneva Accord being honoured by everyone concerned so that a broadbased Government emerges in Afghanistan and peace is restored and the non-aligned status and independence of Afghanistan are redeemed. This has not happened although in the wake of the INF treaty, in the wake of all the areas of conflict suddenly coming into life and progressing in the direction of peace, we thought that Afghanistan, being closest to us, would be resolved satisfactorily and we would have a sigh of relief. This, again has not happened... (*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Don't interrupt. Let him reply. Afterwards, I will allow some Members to put questions, but not now.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, the third area where we had high hopes of an early resolution of the conflict, a conflict which has been simmering for years and years, not just simmering but bursting for years and years, is the Middle-East. Yasser Arafat was here after the new State was declared. We gave immediate

recognition to the new State, but we find that even after Yasser Arafat has taken a number of bold initiatives, the situation has not improved. The stalemate continues and there is a danger that after having taken all these initiatives he will find himself in a difficult situation in PLO itself because the hardliners who were against unilateral initiatives right from the beginning, will have not upper hand. I do hope this will not happen. The international community owes it to Palestine, to the Middle-East to see to it that this does not happen. The silver lining in the cloud is that including the United Kingdom, the West European countries have taken a positive attitude to the Middle-East. We are, of course, positive right from the beginning and the stage is set for a concerted effort for the resolution of the Middle East, Palestine question on the lines which we have been advocating, the Non-Aligned Movement has been advocating, all the time. This has not yet happened but this has to happen and the thrust, the joint thrust of all these countries Non-Aligned, Non-Non-Aligned, if I may put it that way, has to be mobilised in order to see that this tangle is resolved at the earliest and whatever gain we had when Yasser Arafat, very magnanimously, very generously, very positively took those initiatives, is not lost.

Namibia and Kampuchea are in a different category. There has not been a stalemate although there have been difficulties, there will be difficulties until the end of the road is arrived at. But these two have been progressing well. My colleague is right now in Jackarta or one of the capitals of the South-East Asian countries and I am sure that when he comes back, we will have a better picture reported to us. If there is anything on which I have to take the House into confidence, I shall certainly do so.

Sir, after the INF treaty why I said that there has been a stalemate is this. The INF treaty was only the first step in disarmament. Unfortunately, after the first step no other step seems to have been taken successfully. The decisions on strategic arms reduction have not been implemented and, in fact, the possibility of their implementation seems to be receding with ever passing day. Besides, there are new weapons being produced while we are trying to put an end to the weapons already in possession of the nuclear-weapon States. It is rather depression to see that far from bringing their numbers down, for from travelling in the direction of complete disarmament for some reason or the other, on some pretext or the other, more and more sophisticated weapons are coming into existence. So we find that not only there is a halt but also a setback, a qualitative set back in the process and newer systems are being developed and the gains of the INF treaty, limited as they were, are being frittered away and we are in danger, the world is in danger of sliding back to the stage of confrontation again. So, I feel, any one would feel that the process that was started by the INF treaty has not become irreversible as yet. It has not been reversed, fortunately, but it has not become irreversible and, therefore, a special thrust needs to be given, a special momentum needs to be imparted to the process so that it goes ahead and does no get into complications and at some point of time, it comes to a grinding halt and then starts backfiring. This is something which we have to ensure, we meaning, India, meaning the Non-aligned, meaning the entire humanity.

Then, Sir, the Super-power detente has completely left out world economic problems. It is strange that in their preoccupation with the political aspects the economic aspects have been completely left out, maybe deliberately, maybe for some other reason. But we know very well that both aspects are interrelated. You cannot look at the political aspect

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

alone or the economic aspect alone in isolation and, therefore, even while starting the INF process even while starting the political detente, one could see that it was lopsided. Today, more than ever before, the developing countries face tremendous problems, problems which for the last 10 years, I have been following from year to year, but as I look back, I find that the problems faced by them today are more difficult, more intractable than ever before. The external debt burden, protectionism of the developed countries, inferior and uncompetitive technologies which are still dogging the developing countries and their backward economies as a consequence, population explosion, falling relative standards of life and insurmountable problems of development, all these are staring them in the face while there is some complacency about some buyoancy in world economy and that industrialisation is taking place in some countries and markets are being opened up, the real situation seems to be very grim indeed as has been brought out by Dr. Manmohan Singh, who is the Secretary-General of the South Commission. He has brought out certain stark realities which should open our eyes. Those who have been thinking in rather unrealistic terms so far would have to pause and think whether our complacency has not been misplaced. Dr. Manmohan Singh has deplored the ideological pro-private sector fervour of some of the developed countries and international institutions. He callled for a mechanism, for impartial international evaluation of development performance and design of conditions attached to aid to suit the problems of each aid recipient. One of the key issues Dr. Manmohan Singh raised was the need to face up squarely to the consequences of unequal international access to technical knowhow.

"With a few exceptions, the technological distance between the developing and the developed countries is widening. New advances in science and technology are increasingly being privatised, developed countries are now making concerted attempts to coerce developing countries to bring their domestic legislation on the protection of intellectual property into conformity with the interests of technology exporters."

Now, this is a very grim picture. Again, he goes on to say:

"The crisis of development in the 80s constitute a challenge to the entire development community."

Dr. Manmohan Singh further said:

"Several developing countries are now experiencing a negative net transfer of resources from developed countries. No viable solutions to the debt crisis have emerged so far. Developing countries have to contend with the negative fall-out of the accelerated pace of technical progress in developed countries reflected in such phenomena as a reduced use of raw material per unit of final product."

We have not got the full text of his speech. We shall examine the full text because that is going to be very very relevant to India and all other developing countries. Sir, there is one aspect which we have been discussing off and on for the last few years and that is environment.

In our wildest dreams we had never thought that environmental problems would lead to inequalities, inequities and injustice. We thought that the entire environment of the world is one which is a common heritage of mankind and if someone is spoiling the environment, damaging the environment, it is the duty of the international community to stop the damage. It was rather simplistic. Now, after attending a conference in The Hauge, I have reluctantly come to the conclusion that even environmental problems are fraught with

political possibilities, political undertones, maybe overtones. In fact, the idea there was that because environment has been damaged, let us have a blanket ban on the exploitation of natural resources by all countries which means that if a developed country has exploited them, overexploited them, over the years and decades, they will stop where they are today and if there is another developing country which has not even started exploiting its own resources, that also should stop there. Now, a worse example of inequity could hardly be imagined. So, even environmental problems have run into this kind of discrimination. We fought against that trend in that meeting and succeeded to a large extent. But that is beside the point. The point I am trying to raise is, today we have a much grimmer picture of international economic relations than we had ever imagined and this is something which has been completely left out in the super-powers' ethos. In fact, we are facing a situation, we are likely to face a situation in the near future, when the super-powers may decide what is good for us. We are trying to tell them, tell them categorically, that we will not take what they think is good for us as good for us. We will ourselves have to decide what is good for us and they will have to consult us on what is good for us, us meaning developing countries because the ethos is different, the approach is different, the way we look at the problems is different. So, we do not want another proxy-development being thought of and conceived in areas far removed from us and on the hypothesis that they know everything about us. They do not. That is the point. And, coming to the crunch, this is going to be the problem of tomorrow and the developing countries, through the non-aligned movement, would have to continuously struggle to achieve the future they want. Sir, this is the environment in which we find ourselves today and India and other developing countries have to combat these trends, of course, in a friendly manner, in a democratic manner, through the non-aligned movement.

The non-aligned movement itself is at cross-roads today. People say there is no relevance left in the non-aligned movement. What is the movement going to do now? It stood for the independence of countries. All countries have become independent. So, the non-aligned movement has lost one of its legs. It stood for not aligning itself with any of the power blocs. Now the power blocs have become one more or less. There is *detente*. So what is the relevance of the non-aligned movement? These questions are being asked, asked increasingly forcefully, and there is a duty on the non-aligned movement to answer these questions; not only to answer these questions but to function in such a way that the new questions which I have just tried to described briefly, are solved effectively, without sliding back into another problem worldwide. So today we in India are contributing effectively a whole set of new ideas in the non-aligned movement, so as to face the new situation and the new problems thrown up by the contemporary world. We have to change, we have to reorient, the thrust of the non-alignment movement, the immediate objectives of the non-alignment movement, the priorities of the non-aligned movement, the methodology of the non-alignment movement and the organisation of the non-alignment movement—these are inter-connected. If you do not have the necessary organisation streamlined properly to meet the needs of the day, then you will not be able, even with the best of intentions and the best of ideals, to meet the situation.

Now, in a very brief description I would sum up the thrust of the movement as follows: The thrust cannot be on independence of nations because that is over. The thrust cannot be on not aligning with power blocs because that is not quite rele-

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

vant. It cannot be merely propagating for world peace which we have been doing in the movement because everyone says the same thing; even those who are stockpiling weapons say that they are doing it for world peace. So that has lost its value. Therefore, we have to think of a new thrust. The new thrust has to be shoring up the independence of States, to invest it with real independence of judgment and of decisions-making. Today, not every country which is independent politically can say that it has the independence of decision-making, it has the independence of judgement. That is where economic muscle comes in, that is where economic independence comes in and that is where the real task of the non-aligned movement along with the Group of 77 comes in. It has to be consolidation of the peace process all over world so as to make it permanent and dependable. The peace process cannot really continue in speeches and declarations. We have many peace conferences in India. It is just like carrying coal to Dhanbad, because we do not need conferences in India where people come from the countries where warlike preparations are going on, their people coming and preaching peace to the peace-loving people of India. Of course, we always welcome them as our guests. That is beside the point. The point is that these conferences alone cannot deliver the goods now. It has to be made permanent in the sense that where warlike preparations are going on, whether it is in Europe or other theatres of the world, real disarmament has to take place, both nuclear disarmament and conventional disarmament.

And in the field of nuclear disarmament, as I have just submitted to the House, things are not all happy. They are still thinking in terms of deterrence. They think that even if you do not have a very big stockpile, you must have enough to deter the other fellow. And it is precisely this logic which earlier led to the stockpiling of arms, such stockpiles that today you can annihilate the entire world several times over and we will still be left with so many arms with nowhere to throw them. This is the situation that has spiralled up as a result of the theory of deterrence. India has steadfastly opposed the very basis of this theory of deterrence. And one is sorry to see that it has not been jettisoned, that it has not been given up, but it is still ruling the thinking of some countries as a result of which there is no meeting of minds. They think that if someone is asking for peace, he is doing so because he is weak. So, if I am strong and if he is weak and if he is asking for peace, why should I agree to peace? Now, this is the logic. That is why I said there is no meeting of minds. So, it has to be the endeavour of the non-aligned movement to make this peace process permanent and, in order to make it, the questions of disarmaent and, of course, the question of development which is the corollary of disarmament have to be tackled very effectively, and that has to be done by the non-aligned movement.

And then, another thrust has to be the completion of the disarmament process, as I have described, on the heels of the INF treaty, to build up the momentum and to make disarmament irreversible. This I have already submitted. Now, we find today that there are too many slips possible between the cup and the lip. You seem to be coming closer and closer to a very good situation, a very good result. But then there is always something which comes in the way, which supervenes and makes that result much more difficult of achievement. Now, these are the holes, the patches, which, perhaps, the non-aligned movement has to plug and it has to be looking for red signals all the time and wherever there is a signal the non-aligned movement has to be very alert to see that the signal

does not develop into a disaster. So, that has to be the role of the non-aligned movement, and I am glad to report to the House, that in the next summit at Belgrade, the Movement's Heads of State or Government are going to address themselves directly and specifically to all these issues.

Coming to the forum, coming to the organization, we know that the non-aligned movement's documents, even the length of the documents, have come up for a very detailed discussion among the Foreign Ministers and also some Heads of States. We have about 500 or 600 paragraph in a volume which very few people read. I am not sure that, since even the drafting is done in sections, the draftsman of one section knows what is contained in the draft in the other section. It is a tremendous thing and it is just not possible to read it. No Pressman read it and no politician read it. Only they adorn the libraries for some time. This is the criticism about the non-aligned documents which has been voiced, and I am not saying anything for the first time and this has been noticed and the Foreign Ministers have been asked to find a way so that the documents are crisp, are very clear and, at the same time, are comprehensive enough not to leave any of the important, any of the momentous, matters which need to be covered. So, this is going to be a very very difficult exercise. We are trying that. We are going to have a meeting in Harare in May and it is at that meeting that we will have a lot of brain-storming on all these aspects.

The first Belgrade summit had a declaration with 27 paragraphs. Today, we have 600. So, there is something wrong somewhere. There is some kind of a thinking which has become very very diffused; if not confussed, at least diffused. So, we have to bring it back to focus. And, a draft is not just a draft, that is not a piece of paper on which something is written. A draft is a reflection of our thinking and the thinking has to crystallize first which has to be reflected in the draft. This is the exercise we have undertaken. Fortunately, the first Chairman of the Non-Aligned Movement is again becoming the Chairman in September. The Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia was here; he is still here. We had very useful discusions yesterday. We are of the same mind on many of these matters which I have submitted to the House. On the whole, I feel that it is a difficult task for the non-aligned movement to find a new ethos, a new thrust and a new objective, it is not quite new, but a new orientation of the objective. I am sure we are able to know the deficiencies, and that is half the battle won because we will be able to remove those deficiencies to the extent possible and think of a much better organised and better equipped non-aligned movement hereafter.

Sir, these are some of the global matters which I wanted to explain to the House.

On specific issues, points have been made and facts have been given. On Sri Lanka, for instance, it is not possible for me to say anything new today because our Foreign Secretary has gone there. He is going to meet President Premadasa today. Yesterday, he told me that he is going to meet him today. He went as the Prime Minister's special envoy. After he comes back either tomorrow or the day after, I will have occasion to report to the House.

So is the case of Kampuchea.

So far as Nepal is concerned, Atalji and many others made important points. I have made the position of the Government very clear, not once but twice, because I do not want any misunderstanding. We are probably in the same situation where it has not been possible for us to read through the different statements that have emanated from the other side. I am calling my Ambassador. He is coming

[Shri P. V. Narasimha Rao]

in a day or two. Based on our own understanding of the situation, based on our own stand which I have categorically stated in this House, we will examine the entire possibility of the next step being taken. So we will do that exercise. And whenever we are able to come to a decision, I will come back to the House and report to the House.

This is all I can say.

SHRI JASWANT SINGH (Rajasthan): I want to seek a clarification on this aspect alone. The Government of India have stated that they are ready to talk, and the Nepalese Government have also stated that they too are ready for talks. So, would the Minister clarify as to what is preventing the two to talk together?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: As I said, I believe that they want the same thing as we want. I would like this belief to be confirmed. I am calling my Ambassador, and I hope that it will be possible to think of the next step. It is only a question of a few days. Whenever we decide on something, I will come back to the House.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY (Tamil Nadu): A small clarification. Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir, the hon. Minister stated that after the arrival of our Foreign Secretary he will be able to apprise us of the latest position. Sir, we are very much distressed about the attitude of the Government, because twice last year—in the month of January and again in the month of March, that is, on 8th January and on the 11th March—the LTI Chief Mr. Prabhakaran, sent communications for unconditional talks... *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No, no.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I would appeal to Mr. Gopalasamy not to reopen the debate at this stage. *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: The point is, will you end the operations? *(Interruptions)*.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Foreign Secretary has gone there. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: A policy of destruction you are pursuing there. Then what moral right have you got to speak about the gospel of peace? *(Interruptions)*

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): The Foreign Secretary has gone there. He is discussing. He says that when he will come back... *(Interruptions)*

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: What right have they got to speak about peace when they are pursuing a policy of destruction and bloodshed of the LTTE and the civilian Tamils, using the mighty armed forces? Even this minute they are using the armed forces.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He has made the Government stand very clear. The Foreign Secretary has gone there... *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Do you want to destroy them? Will you end this operation?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, you can give him as much time as you like to intervene once again and yet again. I will sit. I have no problem. But we will not be able to get any reply. I have already said that I am waiting for my secretary's return.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Then what is the purpose of this discussion? Will you end the operation?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): He has told that the Foreign Secretary has gone there and if necessary, he will come back to the House. *(Interruptions)* Please sit down.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, this discussion would have been over 5 days back and he would not have been in a position to put this question. I am saying that as we stand today, the Special Envoy of our Prime Minister is having discussions there. We should wait for this return.

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): That is more than enough.

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: Are you prepared to announce unilateral ceasefire?

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: I have answered this question times without number. Is the IPKF coming back? There is nothing new in it. It has been oft answered and, therefore, I do not need to answer it again. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI V. GOPALSAMY: You have created your own quagmire and now you are caught in it

SHRI DHARANIDHAR BASUMATARI (Assam): Sir, recently, I had a very great privilege. I went to Norway and Sweden. According to the programme chalked out by our Ambassador there in Sweden, we had the privilege to meet the members of the World Peace Council. They asked questions about our country and we told them everything. They suggested that one day's expenditure on the Defence Ministry should be given as contribution to the fund of the World Peace Corncil. What is the reaction of our country to that suggestions?

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down, Mr. Basumatari. You are a senior Member. He will answer your point.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: Sir, off-the-cuff questions cannot be answered like this.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI LAL K. ADVANI (Madhya Pradesh): I think the reply is not complete. We were expecting the Foreign Minister to coment on Indo-Pakistan relations after the change of Government in Pakistan and also on China. In the meanwhile, suddenly the reply has eded abruptly.

SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO: On China and Pakistan, no new points have been made. We have discussed both the issues here in the House and there is nothing more to add to what has been said.

(*Interruptions*)

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): No more questions. Please sit down: Enough opportunity has been given. I will not allow. Special Mentions.

डा० रत्नाकर पाण्डेय: (उत्तर प्रदेश) माननीय उपसभाध्यक्ष महोदय, यूनियन पब्लिक सर्विस कमीशन के दरवाजे पर आमरण अनशन पर जो लोग बैठे हुए हैं उनमें हीरालाल नाम का एक आदमी है जिसके जीवन-मरण का प्रश्न है। उसकी अब सांस रुक रही है। उसकी अगर जान चली गई तो इसकी जिम्मेदारी सरकार पर होगी।

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Please sit down. I have not allowed you. Please sit down. (*Interruptions*) I am on my legs. Please sit down. (*Interruptions*) Nothing will go on record.

SHRI DHARAM PAL (Jammu and Kashmir): *

SPECIAL MENTIONS

Shortage of Trained Computer Man-Power

THE VICE-CHAIRMAN (SHRI JAGESH DESAI): Special Mentions—Shri Bir Bhadra Pratap Singh.

SHRI BIR BHADRA PRATAP SINGH (Uttar Pradesh): Mr. Vice-Chairman, Sir...

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI P. V. NARASIMHA RAO): May I go?

*Not recorded.